

REMARKS

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants' representative would like to thank Examiner Philip Tran and Examiner Saleh Najjar for the courtesy of extending telephonic interviews on June 21 and August 3, 2006. During the interviews, rejections of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. Sections 112 and 103 were discussed. Applicants' representative argued that the present application's specification fully supports the claimed subject matter, including the term "respective preference value." Applicants' representative also argued that no prima facie case of obviousness has been established. For the interview of August 3, applicants' representative also presented a proposed amendment that was similar to the current amendment of claim 13. The Examiners agreed to withdraw the rejections and perform further prior art search if the proposed amendment is filed. Thus, no agreement was reached regarding patentability of the claims.

CLAIMS

Claims 13-18 were pending when last examined. Claims 1-12 had been cancelled. With the current amendment, claims 13-17 have been amended, and claims 19-34 have been added. No new matter has been introduced. Support for the amendment can be found at least in FIGS. 3 and 5-8 and in pages 5, 10 and 12 of the specification.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 13, 15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons explained during the interviews and in the Response to Final Office Action, filed April 24, 2006. Nonetheless, claims 13, 15 and 17 have been amended to recite that the respective preference value indicates relative importance. Applicants submit that amended claims 13, 15 and 17 are in allowable form.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 13-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,236,395 to Sezan et al. (“Sezan”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,945,988 to Williams et al. (“Williams”). Applicants respectfully disagree for the reasons explained during the interviews and in the Response to Final Office Action, filed April 24, 2006. In particular, neither Sezan nor Williams discloses or even suggests the preference value as claimed in independent claims 13, 15 and 17. Thus, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established and claims 13, 15 and 17 should be allowable. Claims 14, 16, and 18 are dependent claims that should be allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

New Claims

Claims 19-34 have been added. Support for the new claims can be found at least in FIGS. 3 and 5-8 and in pages 5, 10 and 12 of the specification. New claims 19-34 are dependent claims which should be allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue. Should the Examiner wish to discuss the Application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (415) 772-7493.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1597.

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

8/23/06

Date

Richard A. Pace

Signature

Respectfully submitted,


By: _____
Ferenc Pazmandi
Agent of Record
Limited Recognition No. L0078
FP/rp

August 23, 2006

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
555 California Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94104-1715
(415) 772-1200